United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-3554

United States of America,	*	
	*	
Appellee,	*	
	*	Appeal from the United States
v.	*	District Court for the
	*	Northern District of Iowa.
Robert James Abels,	*	
	*	[UNPUBLISHED]
Appellant.	*	

Submitted: April 25, 2012
Filed: April 30, 2012

Before WOLLMAN, MELLOY, and SMITH, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Robert Abels appeals after he pled guilty to child-pornography-related offenses and the district court[1] imposed a sentence at the top of the calculated Guidelines range. His counsel has filed a brief under Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), arguing that the sentence is procedurally unsound and substantively unreasonable. Abels has filed a pro se supplemental brief also challenging his sentence.

[1]The Honorable Linda R. Reade, Chief Judge, United States District Court for the Northern District of Iowa.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Upon careful review, we conclude that the district court did not commit any significant procedural error in sentencing Abels, and that the sentence imposed is substantively reasonable. See Gall v. United States, 552 U.S. 38, 51 (2007) (in reviewing sentence, appellate court first ensures that district court committed no significant procedural error, and then considers substantive reasonableness of sentence under abuse-of-discretion standard; if sentence is within Guidelines range, appellate court may apply presumption of reasonableness); United States v. Stults, 575 F.3d 834, 849 (8th Cir. 2009) (sentence was not unreasonable where record reflected that district court made individualized assessment based on facts presented and specifically addressed defendant's proffered information in its consideration of sentencing factors); United States v. Haack, 403 F.3d 997, 1004 (8th Cir. 2005) (describing ways in which court might abuse its discretion at sentencing).

Having reviewed the record independently under Penson v. Ohio, 488 U.S. 75 (1988), we find no nonfrivolous issue. Accordingly, the judgment is affirmed. We also construe counsel's brief as containing a request for permission to withdraw, and we grant that request.

Appellate Case: 11-3554 Page: 2 Date Filed: 04/30/2012 Entry ID: 3905981